

APR 12 1964

LOS ANGELES TIMES

FOIAb3b

IT'S MAN BEHIND MACHINE**Washington Quiz Brings Out
Serious Doubts on Lie Detectors****BY DAVID KRASLOW**

Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON — A con-

gressional committee investigating use of the lie detector by federal agencies seems to have established this basic point:

Be wary about polygraph, or lie detector, examinations.

Not because there is necessarily anything wrong with the machine — as a machine — but because of striking testimony that most of the people who operate the machines have no business doing so.

Contrary to what may be popular belief, the polygraph does not detect lies. That is done by the person

operating the device in interpreting physical signs— as recorded on a graph— of emotional changes induced by various questions.

In the words of chairman John E. Moss (D-Cal.) of a House government operations subcommittee: "the human being is the lie detector, not the machine."

Then there is this obser-

vation of Prof. Fred E. Inbau of the Northwestern University Law School: "Eighty per cent of them (persons operating polygraphs) do not measure up to the standards we feel are required."

Neither statement was challenged during the committee's hearings last week. The effect was that a committee which already was dubious, even hostile to the use of lie detectors is testimony on the record.

One source close to the committee does not rule out the possibility that the committee will recommend that the federal government

CPYRIGHT

Continued

LOS ANGELES TIMES

APR 12 1964

CPYRIGHT

Lie Detectors: Inquiry Opened in Congress

The use of lie detection machines by government agencies has become widespread in recent years.

The federal government alone conducted more than 20,000 polygraph tests last year. This did not include an estimated 10,000 tests

given by the super-secret Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency.

There are 639 lie-detector operators in the government who were paid \$4.3 million in salaries last year. Their machines — many of them outdated by professional standards — cost another \$425,000. The military alone owns 400 lie detectors and employs 560 operators.

Unregulated Operators

Qualifications of the operators run from a high school diploma to a doctor of philosophy degree. Lie-detection training runs from five to eight days for the Navy to two weeks for the FBI to seven weeks for the Army.

The use of lie detectors is permitted by 24 federal departments and agencies, but only seven have formal regulations governing their employment.

Because of complaints of misuse of lie detectors by unqualified operators, a House Government Operations subcommittee last week held three days of hearing aimed at developing standard rules to cover operation of the detectors.

"Serious questions have been raised by responsible persons as to whether the polygraph is indeed an instrument which should be used for any purpose. If used, what should be the extent and conditions of its use?" asked chairman John E. Moss (D-Calif.) in opening the hearings in the new \$85 million Rayburn House Office Building.

Sylvester's Refusal

The inquiry was launched at the request of Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher (D-N.J.), who complained last year when Asst. Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester and other Pentagon officials were asked to take lie detector tests in a search for the source of a "news leak" in the TF-X fighter plane controversy. Sylvester refused and Gallagher praised his action.

Gallagher says he also is concerned about tests given to rank-and-file government employees. "Substituting of mechanical apparatus for honor, integrity and dignity has frightening implications."

He said some government workers and job applicants told him they were compelled, or led to believe it was an absolute requirement, to answer questions about their sex lives and other personal matters.

Case of Young Girl

Gallagher told the subcommittee that two years ago a 17-year-old girl, just out of high school and seeking a job as a typist with a federal agency, was strapped into a polygraph machine and asked a series of sex questions, including one about sexual deviation.

"It was a most embarrassing and humiliating experience for her," Gallagher said. "If this is common practice, why? The polygraph operator is investigator, judge and jury, but there are no standards set up for him."

Two subcommittee members — Reps. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) and Porter Hardy Jr. (D-Va.) — criticized polygraph testing by the government.

"As of now," Reuss said, "I think the lie detector is largely bunk." Hardy said it is unfortunate that "all too often we rely on mechanical instruments to measure a man."

Said Chairman Moss: "There is no [such thing as a] lie-detector machine. The interpretation of that machine by a human being is the lie detector. . . . The examiners making these tests have been making scientific analyses with the scantiest of training. This constitutes a danger-

ous invasion of the rights of individuals."

Several lie detector operators testified that they felt standards for operators are needed. Prof. Fred E. Inbau of the Northwestern University Law School estimated that 80% of the operators are not qualified.

The subcommittee released a 1953 letter of the Atomic Energy Commission stating that the AEC had decided against using the polygraph "on a commission-wide basis" in its security program because a study showed the tests would produce "an indeterminate, marginal increase in security."

The California Legislature last year made it illegal for a private business to require its employees or job applicants to submit to lie detector tests. The law does not apply to public agencies and does not restrict polygraphs by police. A person may voluntarily submit to a test given by his employer if he wishes.)

FOIAb3b

CPYRIGHT